THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII AUGUST, 1954 No. 410

Editorial

IT was satisfactory to discover, when the new edition of *Crockford's Clerical Directory* recently appeared, that the independence of the Editor's Preface had been in no way curbed in consequence of the displeasure caused and displayed in certain ecclesiastical circles by what he had said in the previous edition. It was at the time distressing to learn how hypersensitive episcopal skin could be; astringent comments on some grave weaknesses in the contemporary Church as well as on comparatively innocuous sartorial and other foibles of the hierarchy seemed to be equally resented. The Church of England is in fact greatly indebted to the Oxford University Press for relieving it of the necessity of providing the organization and finance without which so indispensable an instrument as *Crockford* could not be produced. We should also say that it is a singular advantage to the Church that the Editor as such has no official ecclesiastical status and is therefore free to speak his mind without fear or favour. Fortunately too the present Editor is eminently capable of maintaining what has now become a traditional standard.

We do not suppose that anyone who thinks for himself has ever agreed with everything that has been said in a single *Crockford* Preface. That is one of its virtues: it follows no party line, and it exposes indiscriminately the various kinds of make-believe and subterfuge to which we are all tempted to resort in one way or another. The Editor's shafts are manifestly well-informed and inspired by a sincere concern for the Church's highest interests. And it would be quite unjust to suggest that his pen is invariably dipped in acid. For the parochial clergy and the ordinary laity his warm sympathy is always apparent; and, while usually his remarks on any single subject are extremely compressed,[1] sometimes he feels at liberty to develop a careful, acute and dispassionate theological argument upon some topic that is, or ought to be, vexing the minds of churchmen. In the current edition, his discussion of marriage and divorce certainly has that character, and should give a salutary pause to those who are at present engaged in revising the Canon Law.

[1] It is probably the habit of compression which caused the Editor, despite his customary lucidity, to pen two sentences in this Preface which, so far as we can see, fail to say what he intends or at least say it inaccurately. We refer to the sentence in the middle of p. v beginning "The full published text of the sermon . . .", and to that on p. x beginning "(i) The proposed imposition of an invariable law . . ."

Nevertheless, it may be that the most important question raised in the 1953–4 Preface relates to the way in which opinion in the Church of England seems nowadays to be really though not blatantly regimented, and the Church itself to be increasingly a close corporation. We apprehend that this is so, and that it augurs ill for the future. "Close corporations", as J. B. Mozley said, "are proverbially inaccessible to new ideas, and blind to new facts; they are averse to any enlargement of mind from without, and their natural tendency is to be the whole world to themselves."[1] We must say that we agree with the Editor of *Crockford* in noting "a growing ecclesiastical tendency to resent all criticism, not because it is groundless or unfair, but simply because it is criticism, and to regard it as lèse-majesté". We agree with him in lamenting that "the late Drs Headlam, Henson, Barnes, and Inge will have no successors in the Church of England as it is controlled to-day", and we are not too confident that they will have successors elsewhere. We have in mind of course, as he has, not their distinctive views but "their independence of mind and courageous forthrightness of utterance". For this reason we are all the more thankful that the Editor of *Crockford* himself shows no signs of succumbing to the spirit of the age.

Finally, in view of the importance of these Prefaces and the desirability of their wide circulation, we should like to second the suggestion of *The Manchester Guardian* that the Oxford University Press should publish the Preface separately for sale as a pamphlet. It would thus be brought within reach of many would-be readers who cannot afford the price of the complete volume. Separate publication of the Preface would presumably be quite practicable, since it is all we have received for review.

* * * * *

To the books that we have already noticed on the subject of the Evanston Conference, mention should be added of Professor Emil Brunner's *Eternal Hope* (Lutterworth Press, 18s.), the value of which is indeed quite independent of the conference, It is a most useful opening up of the whole subject of Christian eschatology, and it can be recommended for group discussion as well as for individual study. It is a first draft of the concluding section of Brunner's *Dogmatics*, and adumbrates a doctrine which is clearly distinguished from that of Barth, Bultmann and Cullmann, and which by its mediating character is likely to appeal—too readily, maybe—to Anglicans.

[1] *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*, p. 22.

American Letter: No. 19

EVANSTON AND MINNEAPOLIS

THE 1954 Assembly of the World Council of Churches, August 15–31, will take place in the heart of what *The Chicago Tribune*, designated by its publisher, Col. Robert McCormick, as "the world's greatest newspaper", calls *Chicagoland*. This ambitious term embraces all territory within a radius of 150 miles and penetrates in theory four States contiguous to Illinois, i.e., Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, and Wisconsin. It is the centre of political isolationism and economic conservatism. As was expected, a local branch of the American Legion has urged the Department of State to refuse visas to delegates who are "communists" or "are antagonistic to capitalism and to America". Named as dangerous to the United States are W. A. Visser t' Hooft, Professor J. L. Hromadka, and Bishop Albert Bereczky of Hungary. The latter two had already been attacked by the American Council of Christian Churches, a dissident minority group of "fundamentalist" bodies. Thus, a less likely or more uncongenial location so far as ready receptivity to, and innate sympathy with, the main purposes and issues of the W.C.C. could hardly have been found in this country. And yet, paradoxically, there is every promise that the selection of Evanston was the happiest of inspirations.

From the point of view of the World Council membership the peculiar character of American forms of Christianity will be far more evident in Evanston than on the relatively cosmopolitan and internationally minded Eastern, or even Western, seaboards. There will be an opportunity to observe the typical American Christian in his native habitat.

No less important will be the leavening effect of a great international and ecumenical gathering on the political, social, and ecclesiastical provincialisms of the heartland of the U.S.A. We anticipate a benediction from the very presence of our visitors and are prepared to offer the genuine hospitality and friendliness which is habitual to the middle-west.

I.—To the readers of THEOLOGY an introduction to the community of Evanston may be of more than slight interest.

Northwestern University, where the delegates will be housed and the meetings of the W.C.C. will be held, is a privately endowed institution founded about one hundred years ago by the Methodists. Its religious affiliation is greatly attenuated and now mainly a matter of tradition. To-day it is thoroughly non-denominational in character Although it has an official Chaplain, a Congregational minister, it has no chapel, only a one-man department of religion, and a studied neutrality in matters of religion.

The student body numbers usually about six thousand in Evanston and something more than that at its "downtown campus" in Chicago, where are located the professional schools. The main buildings stretch along the western shore of Lake Michigan, the second largest of the Great Lakes, for a distance of a half-mile and are on

the whole fairly homogeneous in architecture and pleasing to the eye. The lake breezes give the University section of Evanston only a moderately warm climate in the summer months.

McGaw Hall, where the plenary sessions and public meetings will be held, is a field-house, i.e., an athletic arena, near the football stadium. The building seats about 16,000. It is over a mile from the main University buildings, but special "buses" will transport delegates and visitors between the main campus and the hall. The services of worship will be at the First Methodist Church, a fairly good-sized "neo-Gothic" structure, three blocks south of the main campus.

There are two theological schools in Evanston affiliated with the University. The Methodist School, Garrett Biblical Institute, with about 400 students, is on the University campus; and Seabury-Western Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church is directly across the street. The enrolment at the latter school is only about ninety men, although it is the largest Episcopal theological college west of the Atlantic States. Some visitors to the Assembly and a few of its smaller meetings will be accommodated at these theological schools. Arrangements for a daily celebration of the Holy Communion for Anglicans and Old Catholics at the Seabury-Western Chapel have been made. A general Anglican celebration of the Holy Communion under the direction of the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church will be held at St Mark's Church, Evanston (about one mile from the University). This will be open to the entire assembly.

There are four Episcopal Churches in the city of Evanston. About one out of twenty in the city's population of nearly 75,000 are Episcopalians. This proportion is high for the Chicago area, where one out of ninety is more nearly the ratio.

Physically Evanston is characterized by broad tree-lined streets and mainly single, detached houses. It is a "bed-room" community, i.e., a suburb where the majority of its working people commute daily to business in Chicago. There is some light industry restricted by zoning ordinances to the south-western section. For a North Shore community it has a relatively high negro population.

The phrase "North Shore" refers to an aggregate of suburbs occupying a narrow strip along the lake front for a distance of about twenty-five miles northward from Chicago. All these communities are middle-class to upper middle-class to some upper-class, sociologically and economically speaking. All of them, as might be expected, have a relatively high concentration of Episcopalians. They are "dry" in the sense that no alcoholic beverages or bottled goods may be purchased in them. However, the thirsty have only to go three or four miles westward to what are known locally as "the less desirable" towns to meet their "needs". Evanston itself is the national headquarters and the home of the founder of The Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

II.—On Sunday, August 15, the Assembly will open officially with a Festival of Faith at Soldier's Field, a football stadium, in Chicago. Here before an expected audience of 100,000 will be a service of

pageantry, massed choral groups, and a 200-piece band presenting the major biblical doctrines of Creation, Salvation, and the Kingdom. On Thursday evening, August 19, there will be at Ravinia, an outdoor concert park ten miles from Evanston, a program of masterpieces of Christian music by the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, one of the country's best musical organizations. During the Assembly weeks there will be at the Art Institute in Chicago a special exhibition appropriate to the occasion.

Preliminary arrangements for the Assembly have been worked out by a local group, the Committee of One Hundred, made up of representatives of the University, the two theological colleges in Evanston, and the major non-Roman communions of the area. Church people have been fed, to the point of satiety, on a diet of sermons, addresses, forums, panel-discussions, etc., about the World Council, its purpose and issues.

Most notable among the preparatory activities are the four Ecumenical Institutes centred in some of the theological colleges of the Chicago area. They will run for two one-week sessions, August 2–14, under the leadership of appointed lecturers from the World Council delegates, consultants, and staff. The largest Institute, sponsored jointly by Garrett Biblical Institute and Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, will be open to about 450 ministers and lay people from the various American denominations. It is under the "co-deanship" of the Acting President of Garrett, Otto J. Baab, and the President of Seabury-Western, Alden Drew Kelley.

III.—Not the least in interest among the summer's events will be *The Anglican Congress,* scheduled for Minneapolis, Minnesota (400 miles north-west from Chicago), August 4–13. The official delegates, the bishop or bishops, one presbyter and one lay person from each diocese of the world-wide Anglican Communion, will be augmented by hundreds, perhaps thousands, of visitors, including many who are *en route* to the Assembly of the World Council. The sixteenth city in size (population over 521,000) in the U.S.A., Minneapolis is the manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, financial, and educational centre of a vast agricultural region. The State of Minnesota, "land of 10,000 lakes", is one of the great wheat producing areas and contains the richest iron deposits of the country (over 70 per cent. of the production of the U.S.A.), including the "Mesabi Range" with the largest open-pit mine in the world. Across the Mississippi River from Minneapolis lies St Paul (population over 300,000), the capital of the State and an important livestock and meat-packing centre. These two urban communities make up the "Twin Cities" whose friendly rivalry has been celebrated in legend and song.

The Anglican Congress will be welcomed to the Cathedral Church of St Mark, a handsome edifice erected during the rectorship of James E. Freeman, who later became the Bishop of Washington (1923–43). To extend a cordial welcome to delegates and visitors there will be the Bishop of Minnesota, the Rt Rev. Stephen E. Keeler, and the Bishop Coadjutor, the Rt Rev. Hamilton S. Kellogg.

The theme of the Congress, "The Call of God and the Mission of

the Anglican Communion", will be considered in four sections of two days each. The divisions of the theme are entitled "Our Vocation", "Our Worship", "Our Message", and "Our Work". The Archbishop of Canterbury will speak at the opening service and the Archbishop of Dublin will address the closing meeting.

The far northern location of Minnesota, area 83,429 square miles, with its wealth of lakes, forests and delightful scenery, makes it a popular summer resort region. The population is by religious census predominantly Lutheran, having been settled in good part by émigrés from the Scandinavian countries. Episcopalians number 40,000 out of a total State population of about 3,000,000. It is a small group, to be sure, but not without influence in the history and development of the State.

IV.—Prior to the meeting in Minneapolis there will be held, August 1–3, in Chicago, under the sponsorship of the American Church Union and other Anglo-Catholic groups, *The Catholic Congress*. The sessions, probably at the Chicago Stadium, will be presided over by the Bishop of Chicago, the Rt Rev. G. Francis Burrill, and will no doubt be attended by many from overseas.

V.—Visitors from other lands have often been impressed by a certain brashness and the "activistic" tendency of many representatives of American Christianity. Whatever justification for that judgment there may have been in the past, it does not seem to be the present temper of those most responsible for the various events scheduled for August 1954. Rather, there is a quiet expectancy, an eager but humble waiting for our brethren from the older, and perhaps more seasoned and matured, churches of our respective motherlands. Moreover, it is hoped that our visitors will be aware that any U.S.A. equivalent of the continental European "Americans, go home!" which may be launched by noisy American reactionary groups, is designed more as an embarrassment to us and less as having any significance for those coming to this country. These groups are the surface bubbles on the boiling pot of American politics and will undoubtedly contribute much amusement, "on the side", to the more serious business of the summer's meetings.

ALDEN DREW KELLEY.

Roman Catholics and the Bible

"HE then asked me who it was written for, and I explained to him that it was for everyone, for priests, schoolteachers and for scholars too, and that it was meant to be a summary of biblical knowledge down to 1950. '1950?' he said with a smile. 'Why not 1952 or 1953?' I replied, 'No, Holy Father, that was not possible because it contains about two million words, the proof-reading and printing took about two years to complete.' He then repeated with emphasis, 'I congratulate you and I thank you, and I give my blessing to you and to all who have worked at it.' I then asked, 'And to the publishers too?' And he replied, 'Yes, and to them also.' "[1]

[1] Dom Bernard Orchard, *Scripture*, Vol. VI, No. 2.

Not every Roman Catholic book on the Bible is so important that the general editor journeys to Rome specially to present a copy to the Pope, nor does every such book—for this is an "unofficial" work—receive so warm a welcome. The importance of this commentary,[1] however, extends beyond Roman Catholic circles. It deserves gratitude and admiration—it cannot hope for assent—from all who are seriously concerned with biblical scholarship. It fills a large gap: for Anglicans it is the only up-to-date source-book for Roman Catholic views on the Bible. Its size, scholarship and sobriety are bound to establish it as a standard work in any serious theological library.

Indeed, a would-be reviewer feels *embarras de richesse*: 1,200 pages of closely printed type; nearly 100 pages of index; 44 distinguished contributors, 34 of whom have professorial status; magnificent maps; long lists of "selective" bibliographies (87 publications suggested for the study of *Exodus*), sometimes containing more non-Roman publications than otherwise; more than half as many general articles as there are individual commentaries—these features make any rapid appraisal selective and inadequate.

For most Anglicans, modern Roman Catholic views on Scripture are cloaked in obscurity. Non-Roman books tend to ignore them: there are few readily accessible books by Romans themselves. In 1893 Pope Leo published *Providentissimus Deus* to uphold the absolute truth of Scripture in the face of criticism, and it was during this period that the revival of Roman Catholic biblical studies began. In 1920 Pope Benedict XV published *Spiritus Paraclitus*, with its recommendation of scientific aids to biblical study, while a third encyclical, *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943), draws attention to the need for deeper study of the mode of inspiration. This commentary is plainly the outcome of this direction of study. It is based—so the Preface reads—on "full acceptance (1) of the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture and of the teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church as a divine institution owing its origin to Christ himself, and (2) of the assured findings of modern research, in the conviction that there can be no clash between the Word of God and scientific truth".

At the very beginning of the book the position of the Church (and this means the Roman Catholic Church) is made quite clear. "The Church is superior to the Bible in the sense that she is the living voice of Christ, and therefore the sole infallible interpreter of the inspired Word, whenever an authoritative interpretation is required." (It is, however, surprising to read that under twenty texts have in fact been infallibly interpreted, and that even such interpretations do not rule out other interpretations of the same texts! Apparently a text used in an "infallible definition of the faith" is not considered itself to have been thereby infallibly interpreted.)

The infallibility of the Church does not solve all biblical problems:

> The infallibility of the Church only pertains to all such necessary matters of faith and morals as lead men to heaven, while the infallibility of the Bible pertains to everything authentically contained in the biblical pages.

[1] *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (Nelsons, four guineas).

> It would be erroneous however to think that the Church has no interest in the fact of Abraham's residence at Hebron. It is asserted in Scripture and is therefore infallibly true. The Church, as the champion of the Bible's inerrancy, has the right to condemn any denial of an authentic biblical statement. At the same time, fact, such as that mentioned from patriarchal history, cannot itself be a matter for a positive infallible definition.

Inerrancy is held to include absence of immoral teaching, although the commentaries themselves can scarcely be said to substantiate this claim (e.g. on the imprecatory psalms).

In matters which do not affect faith and morals Roman Catholics are free to choose any interpretation which does not conflict with the inerrancy of Scripture. One of the subsequent features of this commentary is a cautious approach which is combined with great variety of interpretation: on the one hand, the date of the Exodus is said to be so uncertain that no one date is put forward, while on the other hand Dom Butler gives one interpretation of the Synoptic Problem and the commentator on Matthew another (neither acceptable to most non-Romans).

Guidance is, of course, given by the replies of the Pontifical Biblical Commission—careful legal documents which are reproduced here in full. Although Pius X demanded submission to its decisions, yet most theologians seem to hold that it is not impossible for competent persons legitimately to doubt them! Is this perhaps why the commentator on Isa. 63. 7 ff. can write: "It belongs to the early post-exilic period", when the Biblical Commission seems to rule out any author but Isaiah?

> Do there exist arguments which even when taken together avail to demonstrate that the book of Isaias must be attributed not to Isaias, but to two or even several authors? *Answer:* In the negative.

The most interesting feature of the Biblical Commission is that it seems to be capable of changing its mind. Thus its secretary can write in 1946: "The scope and obligation of the decree of 30 April 1934 should not be unduly pressed." Commentators speak of a new spirit in biblical inquiry now that danger of Modernism is past. Great and repeated emphasis is given to the reply of the Commission to Cardinal Suhard on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and on the historical character of Genesis. In 1907 the Mosaic authorship and the integrity of the Pentateuch were "substantially safeguarded". In 1946 the Commission wrote: "We invite Catholic scholars to study these problems [of the Pentateuch] *with an open mind* in the light of sane criticism and of the results of other sciences which have their part in these matters, and such study will establish without doubt *the large share and the profound influence of Moses as author and legislator.*" (Italics mine: would not most non-Roman scholars agree to that?)

Again, in 1909 the Biblical Commission decreed that the literal historical sense may not be called in doubt in the case of facts narrated in Gen. 1–3 which touch the foundations of the Christian faith (such instances being given as the formation of the first woman from the first man). Yet in 1946 the Commission writes that these narratives—

relate in simple and figurative language, adapted to the understanding of mankind at a lower stage of development, the fundamental truths underlying the divine scheme of salvation, as well as a popular description of the origins of the human race and of the chosen people.

There is a difference between literal historical facts and simple figurative language!

The Commission is, of course, extremely conservative and, since higher criticism can give only probable answers and miracles are always possible, there is no way of *proving* that the Commission is wrong or that traditional views of authorship are less important than the probabilities of literary and historical criticism. Most non-Roman critics, for example, will disagree violently with the ascription here of *all* the epistles of the N.T. to apostolic authorship; and they imagine that they can *prove* their case. But they start with different presuppositions from those of Roman Catholics and so they arrive at different conclusions. The great merit of this commentary is that the arguments of the other side are put on the whole with a greater fairness and accuracy than can be met in any contemporary Bible commentary by non-Romans—although such arguments are not often answered on their own level.

At times the commentator is able to be quite "liberal"—for instance, Daniel wrote only individual episodes on separate sheets—"a solid nucleus". Sometimes the conservative case is put almost, it seems, *faute-de-mieux*: the writer on Hebrews concludes that "a genius—such as St Paul most certainly was—is always capable of doing surprising things and experience has shown that comparatively little retouching (especially at the joints) can sometimes work in a writing a great literary transformation". Elsewhere the exegesis has to be more rigid: the Fourth Gospel, for instance, is treated as a strictly historical work. Here Westcott's "concentric circle" argument is used to establish the traditional view about the author (but it is odd to see Bishop Lightfoot cited as one of the able defendants of Johannine authorship). Non-Roman authors who are quoted as holding conservative views often belong to the last century. Some generalizations grate upon the reader: "No responsible scholar now seriously calls into question the fact, well established by sound tradition and internal evidence, that the author of Luke and Acts was Luke, the companion of Paul." On the whole, non-Roman bibliographies are well done, but there are surprising omissions (Creed on Luke, Rawlinson on Mark, Dodd on the Johannines).

The Roman Catholics were late in the field of biblical criticism—a fact which they freely admit. Their indebtedness to non-Roman exegetes is generously expressed, and—with a few exceptions—Protestant writers are treated with courtesy and respect. Special satisfaction is felt at the "supersession" of the Wellhausian hypothesis, "now seen to be false in its main elements". So far as the N.T. is concerned, we are told that (non-Roman) higher criticism set out to destroy confidence in the gospels, but, on a balanced view of the evidence, it has succeeded only in destroying confidence in itself! On the other hand, Roman Catholics claim that, while there is no freedom to pursue error, "in devotedness to truth the liberty of Catholic exe-

gesis is the full freedom of the children of God". It is here that disagreement becomes acute. For the dogma of inerrancy bars their road. Jerome is quoted with approval:

> If I come across something in the Scripture which seems contrary to the truth, I shall not hesitate to consider that it is no more than a faulty reading of a manuscript, or a failure of a translator to hit off what his text declared or that I have not succeeded in understanding the language.

How can there be true freedom of research within the confines of that belief?

A considerable advance has been made by the acknowledgment of different literary forms in the Bible. "The right use of the principle of literary form is based on the distinction between objective facts and the manner of presenting them, between message and envelope." At first sight this might seem to open the flood gates to modernism and even "demythologizing". But the principle is very carefully guarded indeed. In 1903 the Biblical Commission stated that it is not legitimate to assert that narratives are historical only in appearance or form, unless there are solid grounds for so interpreting. (It is a pity that commentators are so little concerned with the literary form of the gospels: the main purpose of Mark, we are told, is not so much to prove that Jesus was Messiah as to narrate the facts of Christ's ministry on earth.)

This principle of literary forms allows questions to be asked on the subject of historicity. "Even a nursery rhyme like 'Little Jack Horner' has its historical basis"—this comment on Job is typical of the dexterity of the book. We are not required to believe that the sun stood still: even the speaking ass may be only a "dramatization of an unusual incident".[1] On the other hand the unity of the book of Zechariah is asserted, the two halves having different literary forms. The following quotation gives some idea of the caution with which fresh ideas have to be introduced:

> The common interpretation of the story of Jonas and the sea monster is not necessarily the correct one. Again, there might be something to be said for the view that the book of Tobias, with its strange miracles, is not really to be regarded as history but is a kind of pious romance. The majority of Catholic scholars will doubtless adhere to the conservative and traditional view, at least for the present.

Although the principle of literary forms eases the situation, it does not radically alter it. The Church still has the last word in exegesis: the Bible is still held to be inerrant. But just how nearly inerrancy can be explained away can be seen by the comment on Matt. 27. 9 f. (where a quotation from Zechariah is ascribed to Jeremiah). After suggesting that either two texts were fused or that a copyist made a mistake, a Jesuit exegete is quoted. He suggests that in any case the principle of inerrancy remains untouched since the mind of the evangelist (?) is not formally to teach the derivation

[1] It is interesting to note that the extreme left wing of the Church can be more fundamentalist than the Roman Catholics, at least where the O.T. is concerned. The literal interpretation of this miracle is demanded in the *New Bible Commentary*, recently published under the auspices of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship.

of the prophecy from Jeremiah but he merely uses the name Jeremias *en passant* "without guaranteeing its exactitude".

It is perhaps inevitable that doctrine at times obtrudes uncomfortably on exegesis. The commentator on Romans prefers the phrase justifying grace to justification: Cana of Galilee is said to show the power of the Blessed Virgin's intercession and even the law of her mediation. There is said to be adequate foundation in the Scriptures alone for Roman dogma about the Blessed Virgin Mary. In order to show the consistency of Pauline teaching on eschatology, it is suggested that *ho kairos sunestalmenos* (1 Cor. 7. 29) means that "the opportunity [of serving God] has been arranged".

So far these remarks have been mainly critical. There is, however, a very great deal of brilliant and lucid scholarship covering undisputed ground. The writers on the Old Testament are well versed in the literature and archaeology of the Ancient World, and the New Testament commentators, while they do not show much interest in Rabbinic literature or Hellenistic writings, frequently allow the Bible to interpret the Bible. The article on "The Interpretation of Scripture" especially contains much of value for the non-Roman. The distinction of three main senses of Scripture—literal, plenary and spiritual—is more satisfying than a theory which only recognizes revelation in the coincidence of event and its interpretation. (This approach includes a salutary warning about typological exegesis: "Many of the texts which at first sight seem to give the spiritual sense in fact contain no more than an accommodation of the O.T.") Few Anglicans will want to adopt the Roman view of scriptural inspiration, but they may well find themselves more at home here than among the competing theories of revelation, so characteristic of non-Roman theology of the last half-century, which seem either to restrict God to one mode of revelation or to make the Bible inspired only where it is inspiring.

This commentary is a dexterous, cautious, yet honest work. Little attempt is made to disguise the obscurities and difficulties that remain in the interpretation of Scripture. On those grounds, at least, non-Romans have no reason for complaint. The interpretation of Scripture remains a problem no less for non-Romans than for Romans, and the latter have no monopoly of inconsistency in their scriptural beliefs. Most non-Roman theology has thrown over once and for all the dogma of scriptural inerrancy: but the recent rediscovery of the inspiration of Scripture and the reaffirmation of its fundamental unity in what is called "biblical theology" mark the recovery of something which the Romans never lost; and for this many Anglicans can be profoundly grateful.

It would be wrong to gloss over the fact that there are many important points where non-Romans will strongly disagree with Roman Catholics about the Bible. The inerrancy of Scripture; the authority of the Church as its infallible interpreter; the position of the deuterocanonical books; the justification of biblical censorship; the doctrinal authority of the Vulgate; plenary indulgences for regular Bible-reading: these are but a few. Nevertheless the largest Church in

Christendom is ponderously, cautiously, but definitely altering its mind about some of its scriptural beliefs. As this commentary notes, "there are many hopeful signs that Catholic and non-Catholic criticisms, as they progress, tend more and more towards a rapprochement".

The writers of this book seem to display a surprising disregard for Protestant Modernism in its "new look" on the Continent. For Roman Catholics the era and so the dangers of Modernism are past, and some disciplinary measures can be relaxed. Unless this new movement in Roman biblical studies is repressed with the violence of a new Syllabus of Errors, it looks as though its impetus in the present century should increase. The ship seems to be straining at old moorings which must break in the end if its momentum continues.

In view of the Roman Catholic appreciation of and respect for non-Roman biblical scholarship, and the corresponding attitude which this commentary must evoke, is there not scope for greater genuine co-operation in biblical studies? In biblical periodicals and conferences alike, only lip-service is at present paid to this principle. Could this not become a real way of growing together into unity, when so many of the other doors seem bolted and barred?

HUGH MONTEFIORE.

The Atomic Age[1]

Luke 12. 35, 36: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord."

THIS complacent world has received a severe shock—in fact, three shocks.

The first was the explosion of atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Most people quickly recovered from that shock, and accepted the delusion of permanent Western superiority in the possession of the new weapon. The second shock was the knowledge that Russia too had the bomb. Somewhat less deluded about our superiority, we carried on with life very much as before. The third shock was the explosion of the hydrogen bomb, and the news that the cobalt bomb is to follow. Popular reaction has ranged from fatalism to hysteria. Few have grasped the real significance of these events. Many are merely numbed by them. Some even "pooh-pooh" the danger.

The issue is rendered more controversial by the fact that the exploitation of atomic energy is capable of being turned to peaceful purpose. Already radioactive isotopes have found important applications in medical science and in industry. The promise of a new source of power, which can supplement or replace conventional sources, is held out to us as we advance into the Atomic Age.

We have therefore in our hands a power which can be turned either to human betterment or to mass destruction. In what respect then does the development of atomic energy differ from any other technical advance? It is a commonplace of all Christian theology

[1] A sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on 16 May 1954.

that man is responsible to God for using his gifts to his honour and glory; and that man's attitude to material things should be sacramental. What then is the Christian attitude to the exploitation of atomic energy? What special problem is raised by the Atomic Age?

If we are to answer these questions, we should first be clear about the essential difference between atomic and conventional sources of energy. Broadly speaking there are three ways in which power may be obtained. *First*, through harnessing the natural motions of matter on the large scale—windmills and sailing vessels, water wheels and hydroelectric generating stations fall into this class. *Second*, through generating heat by the chemical reaction of burning some kind of fuel—steam engines and internal combustion engines do this slowly. Ordinary explosives do the same thing rapidly. *Third*, through harnessing the energy of atomic nuclei.

In this new development the secret lies in converting some part of the actual mass of an atomic nucleus into the equivalent quantity of energy. Herein lies the essential difference. In an atomic pile operating under strict control, or in a nuclear explosion, actual material ceases to exist as material, and is changed into energy. By the use of present-day techniques, only a minute fraction of the nuclear material is so converted. Nobody can say with any certainty what limit there may be to the improvement of our technique in this respect.

The new source of energy so far outpasses any of the sources known previously that the unscientific layman can scarcely glimpse what the future may contain. The new process, moreover, is accompanied by the liberation of highly dangerous radioactive substances; which in the case of an atomic pile demand considerable precautions to ensure safe operation, and in the case of a bomb represent no small part of its destructive power. So great is the power of the new source that it may be possible to drive a liner across the Atlantic on a pound or two of nuclear fuel. Three hydrogen bombs, properly placed, would effectively depopulate this country. The radioactive cloud from one cobalt bomb could destroy life over a whole continent.

To return then to the question: Does the Atomic Age present any really new moral problem? Yes, and no. The moral problem, as before, lies in the use, or abuse, of scientific knowledge and technical ability. But if it is the old problem, it is the old problem magnified so intensely as to become a new one. Previously there were definite limits to the amount of human destruction that we could cause. We are moving into the age when there will be no such limits.

The complete, or almost complete, destruction of the human race, with the vegetable and animal kingdoms, could well be the price of a failure to prevent the large-scale use of atomic weapons. I am not referring to the alarmist speculation that we might detonate the common materials of which this earth is composed. I am referring to the fact that the cobalt bomb (if made and exploded) will cause a cloud from which the intense radiation can be expected to destroy all living things over an enormous area.

The point is that we are moving into an age when there will be

no limits to possible human destruction. In previous wars, the *nation* survived. In the next, the *race* may well be destroyed. This constitutes the new problem, the new threat, the new challenge. It is the very magnitude of the new sources of energy which creates the new moral problem.

The fact that precisely the same technical knowledge and ability may be turned at will either to peaceful or to warlike purposes, with such enormous consequences, means that the new moral issue should have been faced by the whole civilized world before development was allowed to begin. And it is legitimate, therefore, for a Christian to hold that, in view of the danger of its abuse, nuclear energy should not have been exploited for any purpose whatever, either industrial or otherwise.

However, when we recall the history of the past fifteen years, it is clear that at no time could this issue have been faced with any hope of making a sound moral judgment upon it. Before the war, indeed, sufficient of the basic physical facts was known to men of science, but not to the general public. The nucleus was known to be a potential source of almost unlimited energy. And in 1939 nuclear fission was discovered—one of the processes by which this energy could be tapped. Up till then, though fundamental research was becoming increasingly expensive, physicists were content to pursue their investigations using minute quantities of material. Their interest was in pure knowledge, the desire to understand the structure of the atom. At that time it would have been inconceivable that any authority whatsoever should put up the money required for the development of nuclear sources of power.

During the war the situation was entirely different. Each side strained itself to the limit in order to defeat the other. The expenditure of hundreds of millions of pounds on developing a master weapon was sanctioned in the knowledge that the enemy was engaged on a similar project. We may ask now, What was the right course of action for a government to take under such conditions? I for one would not care to have been faced with such a momentous decision. From the easy isolation of not having to take the decision not one of us has the right to condemn the decision which was taken. Man was swept forward by the madness of total war. And what are now offered to us as the benefits of the Atomic Age are but the by-products of an armaments race. In six years of total war, the physicist's dream became the world's nightmare.

At this stage it is practically useless to discuss the total abolition of all nuclear devices. It is virtually impossible to call a halt to further development. To ask Christians to abstain from any part in a national program of atomic development is to ask them to bury their heads in sand. To presume that the vision of world destruction is enough to deter any nation from using the new bombs may be little more than a pious hope.

We must pray that peace may be preserved. We must seek all possible means to mutual understanding and confidence between nations. We should call for a public act of repentance by the Western

powers for the initial use of the atomic bomb; and for a declaration that they will not use it in the future, except to resist attack by similar weapons. These are positive contributions which Christians at all levels of responsibility can and must make.

But this is not enough. It remains for Christians to face this new situation with a new awareness of spiritual realities. Man is a fallen creature. He is not of sufficient moral stature to be entrusted with this tremendous power, which he may use for good or ill. He may lose his self-control in some future international emergency. He may indeed use these atomic weapons for the total destruction of the human race. We dare not say that he is certain to do this, sooner or later; for that would be sheer fatalism. Equally, we dare not say that he will not do so; for that would be sheer folly. What we must do is to face the possibility of an atomic war, in which man himself would perish from the face of the earth. If this should happen, without doubt it would be the "end of the age".

We live in a time of crisis such as the world has never known before. By comparison, 1940 was relative security. But Christianity is supremely the religion of crisis. It was born in a time of crisis, and has brought forth its greatest glories in the lesser crises through which Christendom has passed.

The first Christians lived in hourly expectation of the "end of the age". They had learned to expect the return of their Master during their own generation. Or, since this expectation was not fulfilled, perhaps we should say that they learned to live as though any day might witness his Second Coming. "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord" represents an element in our Lord's teaching which his earliest disciples undoubtedly absorbed and acted upon. The situation created by the opening of the Atomic Age calls for a re-learning of precisely this element of the original gospel.

For 1,900 years the Church has held the doctrine of the Second Advent and the consummation of history. Occasionally this doctrine has occupied the forefront of the Christian mind, and alarmist views of the end have sometimes prevailed. At other periods the Christian mind has become so obsessed with the idea of inevitable progress that the doctrine of the "end of the age" has been associated with the realization of the Kingdom of God upon earth. In our own day there has been renewed emphasis on the view that every crisis of human history is itself a second coming of Christ, in judgment and in opportunity. Without being alarmist, we should at least reckon with the possibility that a large-scale misuse of nuclear energy may provoke the final consummation.

It is by no means inconceivable that the occasion of the consummation should be a catastrophe humanly devised. The end of the Jewish Church as the instrument of God was the moment in which it decisively rejected its Messiah and condemned him to the Cross. This was a consummation humanly devised—a judgment by man which was really a judgment of men. Yet it was also the occasion for God's fresh redemptive activity. In the same way it is conceivable that human

sin, moving irrevocably to the final abdication of moral responsibility, would bring down the ultimate judgment of God on a race which flouts the moral law, and provide the occasion of that supernatural redemptive action to which all Christian history has looked.

It is easy to point to other signs which might indicate the approach of the End—the widespread apostasy of modern man, the increasing secularization of life, the unresolvable conflict of ideologies, the fact that the gospel has at last been preached to all nations, the return of God's ancient people to their own land.

There is, indeed, material in plenty to prompt apocalyptic outbursts from those who are inclined that way. My own purpose in mentioning such matters, however, is far otherwise. Rather would I call all serious-minded followers of our Lord to consider these things as a sober possibility. By God's grace let us recapture the spirit of those earlier followers, who lived in hourly expectation of the Lord's return; and let us learn thereby the sanctity of detachment from earthly things, which is of the essence of the Risen Life in Christ.

To say this is not by any means to advocate an inward-looking pietism. For nothing but a triumphant faith which lives in constant expectation of the End has the vigour to meet the challenge of our times. "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"

G. D. Yarnold.

Missionary Methods in an English Parish

It is often said that the situation in England to-day is a "missionary situation". Certainly to one who returned in the war years from the mission field it appeared not only possible, but necessary, to apply missionary methods in the post-war English parish. When, in 1945, I was appointed to my present parish I found a congregation soundly based on Christian principles in its own interior life, but not, it seemed, sufficiently aware of the growing paganization of the community which was even making inroads upon the life of the Church itself. The lump was leavening the leaven, not the leaven the lump. In particular it was evident that the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Matrimony were being administered to many who had little or no idea of the Christian way of life to which the solemn vows they made were committing them. Holy Baptism was coming to be regarded by many as one of the less important parts of a National Health Service. Being plunged into the maelstrom of a town parish's life, I acquiesced in the situation much as I found it, and in my first year I baptized no fewer than 151 infants and married fifty-nine couples. But it was immediately, and all the time, apparent that parents and other godparents, and the newly married, were not continuing in the ways of the Church to which they had pledged themselves. The question arose, "Was there a simple way of bringing home effectively but naturally, and with all Christian charity, to those desiring baptism for their babies or Christian marriage for themselves the covenantal nature of what they proposed to do?"

A first step was obviously to arrange for parents and young couples to make their first approach, not to the verger (as was then the custom), but to the parish priest. This was soon done, though naturally it meant fewer evening engagements with the social organizations of the parish. Interviews became a pastoral priority for the parish priest. This was certainly a step in the right direction. As it became known that their parish priest was not only willing, but anxious, to see his parishioners personally at the great moments of their lives, for an evening or for a series of evenings at his house or theirs, a new understanding began to dawn on them of God's loving concern shown through his Church. But it was obvious that this, by itself, was not sufficient to recall them to a living practice of religion, and to reinstate the reality of these sacraments of baptism and marriage as spiritual milestones along the road of Christian discipleship. An opportunity had now been created. How was it to be used to the best advantage and to the greatest glory of God?

A study of the "Occasional Offices" themselves (that is, of Holy Baptism and Holy Matrimony) made it apparent that the answer lay already in them, in conjunction wth a very simple principle, which, however, needed bold application. Here in the services, standing guard as it were over the administration of the sacraments, were vows to be made *which assumed on the part of those who were to make them an acceptance*, not only of general Christian belief, but *of very definite Christian practice* of that belief in the fellowship of the Church. The simple principle to be applied was that "vows implying a definite Church practice in the future can be rightly made only by those who are actually performing that practice in the present". It has been a neglect of this principle in the past which has led to the Church feeding her inmost life of faith upon a diet of broken promises.

The sacraments are empty of meaning for those whose lives are empty of the "marks of the Lord Jesus". What are these distinctive "marks" which a Christian is to bear about in his body? What are the bastions by which the fortress of a Christian's life is guarded against the attacks of the world, the flesh and the devil? They are eight in number, and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have set them out in a way which has received general approval from the Convocations and from the Church Assembly in the form following:

A Short Guide to the Duties of Church Membership

All baptized and confirmed members of the Church must play their full part in its life and witness. That you may fulfil this duty, we call upon you:

To follow the example of Christ in home and daily life, and to bear personal witness to him.
To be regular in private prayer day by day.
To read the Bible carefully.
To come to Church every Sunday.
To receive the Holy Communion faithfully and regularly.
To give personal service to Church, neighbours and community.
To give money for the work of the parish and diocese, and for the work of the Church at home and overseas.
To uphold the standard of marriage entrusted by Christ to his Church and to care that children are brought up to love and serve the Lord.

These eight duties are the qualifications of spiritual citizenship which the Church demands from those who seek the sacraments of baptism and Christian marriage. When a minister asks those who bring a baby to be baptized, "Wilt thou . . . obediently keep God's Holy Will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?" and when he asks a man or woman in Holy Matrimony, "Wilt thou take this woman, this man . . . to live together after God's ordinance?" it is these seven duties which are in question. Until a true and reliable answer is given to this question the service may not rightly proceed.

The application of the principle of "present practice of future promises" was therefore undertaken on this basis. Before a baptism was arranged, or *before banns of marriage were taken* (for this is the point of decision), the nature of the Christian commitment involved was made clear in a sympathetic but none the less firm and definite way. Imagine, for instance, two young people coming to put up their banns, their last real contact with the Church having been in their Sunday School days. After a friendly talk to introduce them to their minister (for they probably left the Church in the time of his predecessor), the conversation is led into an inquiry about their present feeling towards the Church and the ways of the Church. This probably elicits such facts as that they are "not against the Church", they "like going to church when they feel like it", "of course we believe in God; but surely you can worship God wherever you are, and not only in church", and "we wouldn't dream of being married in a register office". In all probability, one or both of them have not been confirmed, and certainly Holy Communion does not enter into their pattern of life. When these and similar facts have been ascertained, they are faced with a challenge from their minister such as this: "Well, now, what are we to do about this? I want the very best for you, and I believe God is calling you to a great decision at this time when he is giving you to each other. I am very glad you want to start your new life in his house, but there is a difficulty which I find it hard to explain to you. Perhaps I can put it this way. I am the minister of the Church and her services, and I can only assure you of God's blessing in your new life if you are following in the way of discipleship, as the Church understands the way of discipleship. Look for a moment at the Marriage Service. Before you promise to be faithful to each other you will both be asked if you are going to be faithful to God in your married life—if you will 'live together after God's ordinance'. Until you promise this the service cannot proceed. And when the Church asks you, 'Will you live after God's ordinance?' you are really being asked this kind of question, 'In your new life, will you follow Christ's way as his Church understands it? Will you bear personal witness to him? Will you say your prayers day by day? Will you read your Bible carefully? Will you come to Church every Sunday? Will you come to the Holy Communion faithfully and regularly? Will you serve our Lord in the fellowship of his Church? And will you support his Church by helping to maintain it?' In fact, you are going to be asked questions which only a full Church mem-

ber can honestly answer. If you look at the end of the service you will see that your marriage is not really complete until you have both come to the Holy Communion and pledged yourselves to walk hand in hand through this world and into Christ's new Kingdom, as those whom he has redeemed from sin and death. So that being married in Church assumes that you know you have been 'bought with a price' and belong to your Lord and Saviour. So you see, before we can arrange for your marriage in Church, we must be quite sure that we know what we are doing. You must be quite sure, and so must I, that you are following our Lord as he wants you to follow him. I am going to ask you to go home and pray about this, and see whether you ought not to commit yourselves wholly to Christ, as members of his Church, before you come to be married in Church. Let us kneel together, and ask God to show us what he wants us to do."

In putting this challenge before those who come to be married, or who bring their babies to be baptized, the Church is not "refusing the sacraments" so much as helping to save from a Christian commitment, which they do not understand, those who are prepared, perhaps unwittingly, to masquerade as Christians for a day; and that, one of the most solemn days of their life. Before doing this very wrong thing, the Church bids them "sit down first and count the cost" of being a Christian. If the Church neglects this instruction she is countenancing humbug in the administration of her sacraments, and is encouraging men and women to grasp the shadow of a blessing and to miss its substance. She is laying up condemnation for herself and for them both here and hereafter.

The practical application of these questions is set out in the Parish Magazine in this way:

Length of Notice Required for the Sacraments

For Effective Church Members

Holy Baptism, one week.
Holy Matrimony, three weeks.

For Others

Holy Baptism, one week after the parents have returned to Effective Church Membership.
Confirmation (young people), one year after practising Effective Church Membership.
Older candidates, one month after practising Effective Church Membership.
Holy Matrimony, three weeks after returning to Effective Church Membership.

Note.—"Effective Church Membership" is taken to include, amongst the obvious preliminaries of Christian Discipleship, the following simple Christian acts:

1. Coming to Church at least once every Sunday.
2. Coming to the Holy Communion at least once a month.
3. Making a regular contribution or "member's subscription" to the Church Maintenance Fund. Breadwinners are invited to take one share of £10 a year, which may be paid annually (by Banker's Order), or monthly or weekly in envelopes provided for the purpose. Members of one family, who are not themselves breadwinners, are invited to share this amount between them, and may each have a set of envelopes. If the Church

> cannot afford to do the Will of God, this is a sign of spiritual wickedness. If a Church member is complacent in paying his Church dues, he joins in this wickedness.

Although the incumbents of the five adjoining parishes have not adopted the same practice as that outlined above, there is a growing understanding of the need for reform, and already one incumbent does not receive what he terms "refugees". But in the meanwhile no difficulties are raised if those who do not proceed with Holy Baptism or Holy Matrimony in the writer's parish decide to approach a neighbouring incumbent. This is left entirely as a matter of conscience, and the principle is adopted that if, in another parish, the consciences of all contracting parties (including that of the incumbent concerned) are satisfied, the way should be left wide open for such a service to proceed. All that the writer really denies is the right of parishioners to violate his own conscience in this interim whilst the consciences of others are being awakened.

How, it will be asked, is the day-to-day life of the Church in the parish affected by this quiet insistence upon filling promises with the substance of practice—by expecting from those who are going to make "members' promises" first an instatement, or a reinstatement, of Church membership on a "subscription basis"; subscribing to the faith of the Church, to her worship each Sunday, to our Lord's command to "do this in remembrance of me"; subscribing, too, to the Church's maintenance fund, as every member surely should?

The change can be described as "a fall and rising again of many in Israel". In the past seven years baptisms (which now take place only at the beginning of the morning or evening service, with choir procession to the font) have fallen from 151 a year to 18; marriages from 59 to 10. But attendances at the Holy Communion have risen from 6,953 to 9,408, and in the seven years 97 adults have been presented for confirmation. Membership payments have risen from £244 to £1,015 a year, and other Church collections from £1,469 to £2,027. Four members of the congregation have been accepted for ordination and another has recently offered himself. It is becoming apparent that a Church which takes herself seriously will be taken seriously by her members and by those amongst whom she lives and to whom she is sent.

There are many, of course, both within the Church and outside, who do not want this difficult Church reform. The change has been, by Anglican standards, a sudden one, and twice the provisions of the Parochial Church Councils Powers Measure have been invoked to request the Archdeacon to summon an extraordinary meeting of the P.C.C. to consider what was described as this "intolerable sanctions policy". A Queen's Bench case for libel was brought against the incumbent, and was fought and won, the P.C.C. guaranteeing his costs up to £1,000. But all the time a growing body of opinion in the parish has gradually established itself until recently, by 21 votes to 7, a Parochial Church Council resolution was passed wishing it to be "recorded and known that the Council fully endorses, approves and supports the general policy of its chairman as rector of the parish".

Opposition is no new phenomenon in the Church's history. It is often no more than a testing of new ways before their eventual acceptance as sound and good. It is the preliminary condition normally observed before co-operation proceeds apace. And, indeed, before this co-operation is achieved, little can be done to establish the principles on a firm basis. The secret of progress lies in the growing acknowledgment of a parish policy which is made that of the congregation as a whole. Much of the natural resistance to change is hardly more than a façade which a concerted effort will demolish. For example, in the early days of "reform", a young couple who had lapsed from their Church membership came to arrange for their baby son's baptism. After a long interview they went away, indignantly and without making any arrangement, as they were not prepared to submit to any questioning of their own way of life. On their way home they met one of their neighbours and poured out their troubles, declaring that their child had been "refused baptism". Their neighbour, who knew both the situation at the Church and also the situation in their own home, merely replied, "Oh, I see, you want to make a convenience of the Church, do you?" Within a month the baby had been brought for baptism and both parents were under instruction for confirmation. A firm but kindly blow from parish priest and layman alike had driven the nail of effective churchmanship right home. On the eve of his confirmation this husband said, "Well, Rector, now that I am being confirmed there will just be one little difference in my way of life. Instead of expecting the Almighty to visit me in my house I'm going to visit him in his." In such a simple way does the man in the street declare for the theocentric life!

Another happy young couple, faced with the same challenge, asked to be confirmed before the baptism of their infant daughter, and are now entering more and more fully into the life and worship and witness of their Church. The husband is now one of 40 sidesmen.

Sometimes indifference and ignorance have gone so far that only the first step towards a recall to God can be effected in one short evening's conversation. "I won't argue with you," said one prospective bridegroom, going away from an interview with his parish priest without arranging for his wedding (but all knelt in prayer before parting); "I won't argue, because I know you are right!" This young man and his bride-to-be, losing the doubtful blessing of a meaningless marriage service in the Church of their too-casual choice, have gained the blessing of learning respect for a Church which one day they may aspire to join as full and effective members. A register office marriage that eventually leads into the Church is better than a "church wedding" that eventually leads into the Divorce Court.

The fact that the congregation understands and endorses this parish policy enables the parish priest not only to say, "I think you should live this way", but also to add, "and my congregation expects it from you". A baptismal or wedding interview is therefore no longer just a meeting with the vicar but rather an encounter with the Church.

Co-operation followed in other realms of the Church's life. The priority accorded by the parish priest to interviews revealed the truth

(long obscured by the appropriation of house-to-house visitation by the clergy) that there is an "office and work of a layman in the Church of God". Members of the congregation commend their Church and their faith by visiting in the parish at regular times. They are learning to meet criticisms of all kinds with simplicity and truth. Living alongside their neighbours they have a natural and informal approach to them which is denied to the clergy. For too long, in this respect, the clergy have been doing the work of the laity, and inevitably not doing it as it should be done.

In Church finance, too, there has also been a gradual co-operative advance. The misleading title of "Free Will Offering Scheme" for the Church's regular "housekeeping account" was changed to "Church Maintenance Fund" by a unanimous resolution of the Parochial Church Council. When the fund passed the £1,000 mark, a further resolution empowered the Church treasurer to invite such assistant treasurers for the fund as he should deem necessary. To dispel the cramping idea that the payment of Church dues (as distinct from the giving of alms) was a matter of secrecy, and to inculcate the idea that here was a legitimate field for open, but unostentatious Christian witness, both the incumbent and the Church treasurer (clergy and laity here again sharing in the work), independently decided to publish in the Parish Magazine full details of their respective incomes, and the actual amount each paid to the Church Maintenance Fund and how they paid it. The week following this publication one Church family increased their joint contribution to £20 a year, and others accordingly.

Gradually the Church Maintenance Fund is taking over the whole task of "maintaining the Church" at a cost of £2,400 a year. As a half-way measure towards Alms replacing Dues at Divine Service, the collections at Evensong are wholly given to the Diocese. They are taken apart from the singing of a hymn, and the congregation kneels and prays for "the Month's Special Object" in the work of the Diocese when they are offered, to the accompaniment of the singing of an Offertory Anthem.

In a year when there was a substantial deficit from the previous year, the churchwardens made an act of faith and removed all Communion alms, including those of the main morning service where this was a celebration of Holy Communion, from the P.C.C. accounts, purchasing a separate vestry register for the purpose, thus releasing a sum of £562 for outside objects. Their action was justified, and the succeeding year the deficit was actually reduced, in spite of this substantial subtraction, the bulk of which had previously been relied upon for Church expenses. The result of this following of the Communion Rubric, and removing the possibility for using Communion alms for parochial purposes, has been that at the beginning of each year the incumbent and wardens are in the unusual position of having to dispose of some £500 to £600 of regular income. They can therefore make pledges up to approximately this amount, knowing that it is as reliable as the celebration of the Holy Communion and cannot be diverted for use in the parish. They have in this way

undertaken to augment the stipend of a country incumbent by £50 a year for five years. They have guaranteed £200 per annum for three years towards the stipend of an assistant priest in one of the new towns in the diocese. At the beginning of one year they promised the Bishop of Kurunagala the sum of £100 for visual aids in his diocese: the Bishop bought the equipment forthwith and arranged "deferred payment" terms for the parish to attend to! So that, as the Communion alms were taken each third Sunday of the month, the effect was already being felt in the use of film projectors and strips by pastors in the villages of Ceylon.

A new attitude has developed with regard to the Diocesan quota, met, of course, as a Church expense. Although the parish assessment remained at £136, this amount was voluntarily doubled in one year, and a unanimous vote of the Parochial Church Council raised it to £450 per annum for the next and succeeding years. The quota is being seen not as a minimum contribution expected from the Diocese, and grudgingly paid, but as a return willingly made in the present for blessings received from the past. The ultimate ideal is to make it at least as much as the stipend endowments of the parish, which are still some £270 ahead. The parish will then have "balanced her budget" and be freed of subsidy, which surely should be the aim of every endowed parish.

These results are the natural outcome of linking the payment of Church dues with the idea of Effective Church Membership. As has been said above, for a Church not to be able to afford the will of God is a sign of spiritual wickedness, and any one of her members who is casual and complacent in this important matter is joining in, and adding to, this wickedness.

One of the curses of the Church of England is that whenever a parish applies itself to a new piece of work involving expenditure, the first thought of her members is, "Where can we get a grant for this?" This grant-infested attitude saps the spiritual life of a parish.

It was because it was now becoming clear that a parish which depends upon external grants is still in fact a part of the mission field, that the parish declined the Church Commissioners' kind offer of a grant towards a new parsonage which it was decided to build. Having only £1,000 for the purpose, the Parochial Church Council took out a mortgage for the remaining £3,000, so that Church people for the next fifteen years should share the privilege of rehousing their parish priest. With this, as with all other Church expenses, the principle that is being followed is that those who pray with the Church should pay for the Church they pray in and not expect others to do this for them.

J. C. Wansey.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Kelley is Dean of Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston.

The Rev. H. W. Montefiore is Vice-Principal of Westcott House, Cambridge.

Dr Yarnold is Vicar of Malden; he was formerly Senior Lecturer in Physics, University of Nottingham.

The Rev. J. C. Wansey has been Rector of Woodford, Essex, since 1945, and he is a Proctor in Convocation. He was a missionary in Japan from 1937 to 1940 and in West Africa from 1940 to 1941.

CORRESPONDENCE

MASSING PRIESTS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Suggestions for the reform of the Church in these days are so many and varied that it is possible to become a collector and connoisseur of them. I am most grateful to Mr F. B. Welbourn for his latest example to add to my collection.

I am vastly intrigued by his proposals for Presidents at the Eucharist. He maintains that through the secular occupation of these presidents, and "through their presidency, in the full sense, of the congregation outside as well as within the Church building, the mass would be seen as the activity of the whole Church, the essential focus of the total offering of the Church's life".

While this would be quite true if the local congregation could be regarded as "the whole Church", surely much of the meaning of the mass would disappear if this were the case. And, in any case, the kind of congregationalism which would be encouraged by such an arrangement is something which tends to obscure the true nature of the Church.

The presidents are to be "men who have shown themselves, in secular life, to be the natural leaders of the community". Let us face the facts. The natural leaders of the community are almost always political leaders, and that means that they belong to a political party. The local congregation that they would gather round them would tend to become coloured by certain political views. Can such a gathering be called the local Church? Again, what happens in an industrial community, where there is a duality of leadership, with employers on the one side and trades union leaders on the other? Who is to preside at mass? I presided regularly in such a community as a young priest of twenty-six. Mr Welbourn might say it was most unsuitable. But it solved the difficulty, for at least I had no axe to grind.

Yet again, what happens to "the natural leaders of the community" when they retire? I now live at the seaside, where retired clergy abound. They are accepted as occasional presidents at the mass because, as priests, they have the authority of the whole Church to do so. But what of retired past-presidents? Would they be accepted as having been the natural leaders of other communities? I suppose so, but only by virtue of their ordination, and in such circumstances

they would not help to reveal the mass as the activity of the whole Church any more than ordinary priests do at present.

St Peter's Vicarage,
St Leonards-on-Sea.

Yours sincerely,
Charles Williams.

TWO WAYS TO GOD—OR ONE?

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

"Two Ways to God—or One?" ends just as it gets exciting, leaving us uncertain about the technique of affirmation: how to watch feelingly, "not only look but gaze" at, a "signpost to God". Ordinarily one gives a passing glance at a signpost. At the same time one must look well (C. Williams's injunction). G. M. Hopkins, examining "the pattern of the glory" in harvest time, can

> . . . lift up heart, eyes,
> Down all that glory in the heavens to glean our Saviour;

and sees that

> the azurous hung hills are his world-wielding shoulder
> Majestic . . .

He also says to us, concerning natural beauty,

> . . . See: it does this: keeps warm
> Men's wits to the things that are; what good means—where a glance
> Master more may than gaze, gaze out of countenance.

We read the book of natural beauty on the run or we sink into epicureanism. "If only," as the Rev. Hugh Blenkin says, "we have eyes to see and will to follow where we are being led"—there is another and authorized tradition where the simultaneity of affirmation and rejection presents us with signs of "profound theological significance" valid for all men: Orthodox Iconography. Here we have a more-than-natural standard for testing what might have seemed to us insights into "the pattern of the glory" in natural phenomena. And without some such guidance how would anyone "in the non-ascetic tradition" (unlike Hopkins) know where his "images" were leading him? If our "images" are not to play us false they must be cleansed from religious sensualism and find themselves at home among the icons. Suspected spiritual things need to be compared with proved spiritual things. The icon, with its "almost puritanical hostility against the sensuous" (A Monk of the Eastern Church, *Orthodox Spirituality*, p. 35), is the meeting place of the *via negativa* and the way that makes flesh and blood the "starting point for" its "own visions" (C. S. Lewis, *Arthurian Torso*, p. 114). Nine years after the death of Charles Williams and nine hundred since the Great Schism, perhaps someone could tell us more about this aspect of Byzantium.

We are, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
Alan G. Hurst,
Norman Hill,
Assistant Priests, St Margaret's, Swinton.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE ENGLISH PHILOSOPHERS. By Leslie Paul. Faber and Faber. 25s.

The author tells us that this book had its origin in a series of lectures in the European service of the B.B.C. entitled "Anthology of English Philosophy". This explains the large amount of space given to quotations, and also the fact that the author's comment is mostly separated from exposition and appears usually in a few epigrammatic paragraphs at the end of a chapter. Each philosopher is introduced with a short anecdotal section on his life, just enough to put him in his historical context. The result is an extremely clear and readable book which carries its own guarantee of fairness. It is something of a *tour de force* to have covered so much ground in so short a space without giving an impression of superficiality. A study of philosophy is bound to go into the detail of arguments; conclusions without the arguments that lead to them can appeal only to prejudice; and answers to questions which are not clearly formulated are inevitably taken to be out-of-date answers to our own contemporary questions. Mr Paul's exposition avoids these dangers, and yet he never loses himself in the maze.

The general temper of the English philosophers is shown to be empirical in a broad and proper sense. This characteristic is found, with a half-humorous apology, as far back as Pelagius. "How may it be put? A certain self-reliance? An impatience with subtlety, particularly over moral issues? A proneness to the rejection rather than the making of doctrine?"

Our philosophers take it as their duty to justify intellectually the actual interests and values of their time. Thus Francis Bacon was perhaps the first of those gifted amateurs who have generalized, wisely or unwisely, from the clues given by contemporary science, and, if they were men of genius, have seen the shape of things to come. Our philosophers have seldom been out of touch with contemporary events, and have often had a very close connexion with practical affairs. Hobbes' defence of absolute government, Locke's common sense and reasonable compromise, Adam Smith's preaching of *laissez faire*, Bentham's bourgeois hedonism, and Herbert Spencer's ruthless doctrine of inevitable progress, are obviously schematizations, or rationalizations, of what was happening and going to happen in their world. Such writers were very influential, far beyond the circles of professional philosophers, in so far as any such existed.

It is one of the curiosities of the subject that, as Mr Paul points out, Hume's scepticism provoked violent reactions in metaphysicians and theologians, but none at all in scientists, who were quite content to go on thinking and making discoveries about real things and causal laws, in spite of his having shown that there was no rational basis for believing in either. This suggests that there was something wrong about Hume's starting point. "The whole English empiricist tendency" (sc. in philosophical writers as such) "has been to resolve everything into *perception*", with "fatal consequences for philosophy

and common sense". Mr Paul gives a brilliant description of Bertrand Russell's attempt, from the same starting point, to justify the belief in science, with the added complication that the world as science describes it is now also far removed from that of common sense. What Russell does not do, at any rate in Mr Paul's exposition, is to justify his own passionate moral concern with the welfare of that set of separate experiences which for convenience we regard as having a common object labelled "Mr Jones".

Meanwhile we have been given a clear account of the revolutionary change in climate due to Darwin and his interpreters, with the various theories of Emergent Evolution.

In this perspective the English idealists of the late nineteenth century—Green, Bradley and Bosanquet—appear to stand outside the main stream and to have had comparatively little effect outside academic circles. This may however be misleading, for they provided the working philosophy of many remarkable public men, and through William Temple and others helped theology to adjust itself to scientific and historical discovery. This line of thought might have been longer lived and more influential, and Temple himself not written off so quickly as "dated", but for the disastrous losses of men and ideals in the two great wars. Certainly "the rejection rather than the making of doctrine" has received an impetus from the fearful results of Marxist and Nazi absolutism, and the present temper of English philosophy is metaphysically agnostic and ethically empirical. It may also be that the multiplication of academic posts labelled "philosophy" encourages in their holders a tendency to specialize and to write for one another. It is much to be regretted that much theology in the last few years has been as woodenly literalistic and as technically isolated as Logical Positivism itself.

Mr Paul hints in his last few pages, with a well-deserved bow towards Professor Dorothy Emmet and R. G. Collingwood, that the contemporary "retreat from philosophy" may be due to an inability of the "empiricist" to be critical enough of his own presuppositions, which are themselves historically conditioned. A book like the present certainly encourages the reader to see how "naturally", even inevitably, the philosophers of other times "started from where they were". In no respect do they appear more dated to us than in their willingness to call in "God", "the Creator", or "Divine Providence", to solve their dilemmas.

It would seem possible then that English philosophy may once more become interesting, and even metaphysical, without ceasing to be genuinely empirical, in the proper sense of appealing to experience. But the experience to which it can appeal will not be that of a sophisticated Englishman vainly trying to construct a universe out of the "perceptions" he has laboriously extracted (with the help of the English language) from the whole of life; but that of a living being, conscious, howbeit dimly, of his links with the distant prehuman past. Confusedly perhaps, as in a dream, but very intimately, he will be aware of the symbol-making and symbol-using faculty, without which he could never even recognize two "appearances" of

the same "thing". He will be aware of the miraculous power, but also of the limitations, of discursive reason and of the subject-predicate form of discourse. Art and religion, he will see, are not irrational because they cannot be expressed in literally verifiable sentences; they have a logic of their own, and a truth which can only be arrived at in their way. There are signs that theology too is loosening up, and we may hope, that with help from the existentialists and a new willingness to discuss the function of "mythology", philosophy and theology alike may realize that knowledge is not illusory because it is bound to be partial, nor truth unattainable because it can only be apprehended or expressed in symbols.

LINCOLN. T. R. MILFORD.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY. By H. Burn-Murdoch. Faber and Faber. 42s.

At the Vatican Council in 1870 Pope Pius IX declared that "the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other churches, and all, both pastors and faithful, are bound to submit to the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. . . . This is the teaching of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation". This was followed by the carefully safeguarded decree of infallibility. In 1896 Pope Leo XIII decreed that what Pius IX had declared in 1870 was "no newly conceived opinion . . . but the venerable and constant belief of every age". In 1912 the Rev. Edward Denny refuted the statement of Pope Leo. He did so by the usual methods of historical research, and in a most laborious and lengthy book made it clear that the records which have come down to us show that the bishops and other members of the primitive Church had no idea that the Bishop of Rome had a primacy of jurisdiction or any sort of infallibility. Although numerous little books on both sides of this controversy have since been written, yet Denny's *Papalism* has never been answered. It seems that there is no answer on the lines of historical research. But Roman Catholics have another means of discovering historical truth, which is best expressed by the logic of Duns Scotus. *Potuit, decuit, ergo fecit.* "God is almighty, it was necessary that the Bishop of Rome should always have had a primacy of jurisdiction, therefore he always had one." It would seem that there is really nothing more to be said.

However, Dr Burn-Murdoch has written another Denny, although he would not admit it to be such. He claims that his book is "not so much controversial as (to coin a word) ambiversial". He certainly sets "the opposing views and arguments side by side", but he leaves us in no doubt about the side on which he himself stands. In the main the Roman Catholic arguments are fairly stated and then promptly knocked down, sometimes by extracts from Denny but more often by the author himself. The game of skittles is played as follows. Almost all the New Testament and Patristic texts that have been used in the controversy are carefully examined. Those who believe that they support Papalism as we have it to-day are the Ayes.

Those who disagree are the Noes, and the Noes always have the last word.

There is room now for a modern Denny to back up the books like *Infallible Fallacies* and *Why I am not a Roman Catholic*, but an author who claims to be ambiversial should be careful to omit nothing which supports the view he does not hold. The Church in Asia was divided on the question of Montanism. The Bishop of Rome was on the point of recognizing the Montanists and thus, according to Tertullian, was bringing peace and unity to the Churches of Asia. (*Against Praxeas I.*) It is a small point which Dom Chapman, when answering Bishop Gore, thought was illuminating, and it ought to have been included. Likewise, when relating how the Eusebians excommunicated the leading western bishops after the Council of Sardica, the author should have added that they called Pope Julius *princeps et dux malorum*.

Much irrelevant matter could have been omitted, but in the first three centuries the author is determined to leave no stone unturned, so after a brief chapter on Clement of Alexandria we have: Ayes, "The subjects on which Clement wrote did not involve the constitution of the Church, and did not call for an explanation of the papacy." Noes, "This outstanding theologian and teacher, even when distinguishing true faith and heresy, never refers to the Roman Church or to its bishop."

However, the relevant matter is fairly dealt with, and the author is profuse in quotations from Allnatt, Rivington, Chapman and other defenders of papalism. The detailed study ends at A.D. 500, and after that important episodes such as the Condemnation of Pope Honorius, the False Decretals, the Papal Schisms and the Council of Constance are dealt with by the same method.

Dr Burn-Murdoch thinks that Papalism as defined at the Vatican Council is "the great and formidable barrier" between the Roman See and the other Catholic Communions (p. 29).

There are a number of slips or misprints, two bad ones as regards dates on pp. 345 and 374.

SANDRIDGE. E. GILES.

THE IMAGE AND LIKENESS OF GOD. By Gregory Dix, O.S.B. Dacre Press. 5s. and 6s. 6d.

FAITH AND PRAYER. By Vincent McNabb, O.P. Blackfriars. 13s. 6d.

Dom Gregory Dix was one of the best-known figures in the Church of recent years. He is remembered as something of an *enfant terrible*, a vigorous and subtle controversialist with a mordant and sometimes disconcerting wit, an historian, an eminent patristic and liturgical scholar, but, although the flame of his devotion breaks through his scholarship from time to time, only those nearest to him knew the depth of spirituality which underlay the many gifts and activities of this son of St Benedict, and his intense love for souls.

We have here a Retreat given on different occasions to Priests and Religious, but there is little or nothing in it which is not equally

applicable to lay-folk, since it is concerned from first to last with the Christian soul and its relation to God. Man, the created image of God; the defilement of that image by sin; its restoration by our crucified Lord; its multiplication by Baptism and Confirmation; its perpetuation in the Mass; its burnishing in prayer and recollection; such is the simple yet profound plan of this Retreat, informed by theology and much meditation on Holy Scripture and expounded with the clarity of one who lived what he taught. It will open to many views of their Faith which they had not previously seen, and our gratitude is due to Dom Gregory's Abbot for his labour of love in editing the book for publication.

Our second book is a new edition of two sets of Conferences given in Oxford to undergraduates, and previously published in 1903 and 1905 respectively. Father McNabb was also a well-known figure. As Father Hilary Carpenter writes in his Preface, "Few priests have made a greater or more lasting impact on this country as a whole during the present century than Father Vincent McNabb, who became something of a legend even in his own lifetime . . . well fitted by nature and by grace to appreciate the supreme paradox of Divine Truth". As a true son of St Dominic the apprehension and contemplation of that Truth was the supreme end of his life and his vocation *contemplata aliis tradere.*

If in this book we miss the wide patristic learning of Dom Gregory, we find instead the profundity and clarity of St Thomas applied to our present-day needs by one of his most apt pupils.

In the first course Father McNabb justifies the Thomistic distinction between the spheres of faith and reason, expounds lucidly the nature of faith and vindicates its certitude. These Conferences are half a century old and the author goes back thirty-odd years before that in taking his stand upon the relevant decrees of the Vatican Council, yet he speaks to our present condition as relevantly as if this were a new book, if we except his scholastic psychology, and even there it is the form rather than the substance which is outmoded. This seems surprising until we realize that the Vatican Council was facing the Darwinian-Spencerian revolution and the onset of liberal theology and that its real business was to vindicate the credibility of Christian Faith rather than merely to promulgate the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Since then new problems have been posed but the fundamental questions in men's minds remain the same and Father McNabb's teaching, which is by no means solely concerned with the decrees of the Council, retains its authority.

The chapter headings of the second course do not suggest any great originality in the subject-matter, but the reader should not be misled by that. In fact, in the first five Conferences Father McNabb is at his best (the last three rather suggest that he was getting a little tired with his subject). This is not an academic discourse; the author is dealing with fundamental principles. "If you are to be men and women of work and worth," he says, "you must be men and women of principle; that is, you must not merely act upon principles, but you must know the principles upon which you act"; but he says also,

"I should be doing myself and you an ill turn if at the end you knew whatever concerned prayer, yet did not know or know better how to pray." The Thomistic principles of prayer clearly explained with a view to praying better, enlightened by the wisdom of one who was himself a man of prayer; that is what we find in these Conferences.

THE DEANERY,
WELLS. F. P. HARTON.

POLITICS OF BELIEF IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE—LACORDAIRE, MICHON, VEUILLOT. By Philip Spencer. Faber and Faber. 25s.

It is a happy chance that this book should have appeared almost simultaneously with Dr Vidler's recent study of Lamennais, for it takes up the story of Liberal Catholicism and Ultramontanism in France almost at the point where Dr Vidler laid it down and carries it to the death of Veuillot in 1883, thus covering a period of extraordinary vicissitudes. In 1831 there were many who thought that Roman Catholicism in France was as good as dead, yet four years later Lacordaire at Notre Dame "drew crowds such as the Cathedral had not seen since the Middle Ages". The revival did not last, but the Church won new ground and new opportunities with the Loi Falloux of 1850. Yet these opportunities too were lost, for Gallicans and Liberal Catholics alike went down before an Ultramontanism which, however triumphant, could not compete intellectually with the secularist theories of an increasingly industrialized society. The Republicans of 1848 were friendly, but the Republicans of the 1870s were predominantly anticlerical: in the intervening time the Rome that had already by condemning the *Avenir* dashed the hopes of men who wanted to win the modern world for Christendom had dashed them anew with the Syllabus of Modern Errors and other pronouncements. By 1883 the outlook had again grown dark. It is one of the excellences of Dr Spencer's able and learned volume that these vicissitudes and the magnitude of the issues involved are so clearly and sympathetically delineated. He constructs his narrative round three individuals, but gives it such breadth that they are seen against an immense background.

Lacordaire, Michon, Veuillot—all three were in some sense heirs of Lamennais: Lacordaire, his immediate though not very loyal disciple; Michon, who preached the separation of Church and State and is now forgotten except perhaps as the father of graphology; and Veuillot, the great Ultramontane journalist. But, for all their talents, they were lesser men, and Dr Spencer has singled them out mainly because they exemplify certain eternal problems. In Lacordaire he sees the man whose task it was "to make religion emotionally acceptable . . . to his contemporaries"; in Michon's story the recurring conflict between intellectual speculation and orthodoxy; while the career of Veuillot, who "sedulously cultivated intellectual hebetude", set the problem of toleration. These last are problems which, as Dr Spencer says, "are not—and never will be solved"—hence their abiding interest; while the tale of Lacordaire has no less appeal because

"the emotional adaptation of society to religion has to be grappled with afresh in each new generation".

A few points are open to query or correction. Was the Concordat of 1801 really "drained of effect" by the Organic Articles (p. 22), and is it exact that the publication of *Paroles d'un Croyant* advertised Lamennais' loss of Catholic faith (p. 49)? The founder of the Saint-Simonians was a Count, not a Duke (p. 51). It is not quite true to say that the July Monarchy Chamber was elected by "two hundred thousand bourgeois" (p. 105), since any nobleman or landed proprietor who paid the requisite sum in direct taxes also had the vote. Guizot did not become Prime Minister until 1847 (p. 112). The phrase "Lamartine had formed a broadly based administration" is an odd way of expressing what happened on Louis Philippe's fall (p. 120), and Lamartine certainly has no title to be called an experienced statesman (p. 121). But these are details, and Dr Spencer is warmly to be congratulated for having written such an understanding work on a fascinating theme.

Corpus Christi College,
Cambridge. J. P. T. Bury.

The Nineteenth Century Country Parson (1832–1900). By A. Tindal Hart and Edward Carpenter. Wilding and Son, Shrewsbury. 16s.

How pleasant it is to take up a book about the clergy of the good old days which seems to have no partisan axe to grind; how delightful at the close of a day in the garden to relax and read about the parsons and squarsons and their rural flocks in the days before the deluge (i.e. c. 1914); how refreshing to turn over the pages of the diaries of the contemporaries of Kilvert whose entries, if lacking his command of simple English prose and his eye for detail, nevertheless evoke the ever-latent nostalgia for the day when the parson's diligence and acceptability depended upon his knowledge of, and intimacy with, the occupations and the gardens and the fields and farms of his parish, when the rural clergy were handier with the reins or the spade than with the pen filling in the form "to be returned to this office before May 1st". Escapists should summon up enough hardihood to see that this volume is bought for the diocesan clerical library; it will enable them to return from the day-long dilapidations committee secure in the prospect of a long evening of relaxation to their pleasure and profit. So tightly packed is it with good things, with tales old and new of churchwardens and choristers and bellringers and other characters, with the raw material for a dozen theses on the social and ecclesiastical background of the Gladstonian era, with the first appearance and sudden development of some of our own problems, that a reviewer can do no more than indicate the riches of this goodly storehouse and refer for proof to the index of places and parishes at the end.

The Historical Introduction and Part I have no peculiar merit. They sketch the familiar story of the English country parson with

perhaps overmuch reliance upon Trevelyan and Moorman—though thence, we may assume, arises the welcome acknowledgment of the vital importance for the Church of the parliamentary and administrative reform after 1832 under the impetus of the new Liberalism. Nor should some excellent citations from the more progressive bishops and dignitaries stressing the need for new bottles to contain the new wine (e.g. pp. 8–10) be overlooked. But it is Part II which provokes the greater measure of appreciation—the Diaries of (or rather, alas, only Extracts from) six country parsons each preceded by a brief résumé of his career and character. All are delightful and revelatory, and the only complaint is that each is somewhat too brief to allow the reader to soak himself in the atmosphere or to tarry with the company day in day out as he does with Woodforde or Kilvert or Atkinson in his hand. However, the selections from the six diarists stimulate the appeal to local patriotism and, one way or another, a wide and representative area is covered, from Lancashire to Hants, from Essex to Somerset. And this territorial breadth provokes more than local sentiment; it poses problems which only the expert in ecclesiastical administration could pretend to solve. Why, for instance, did poor worried James Lee Warner now in Sussex run into difficulties over a faculty for a new organ while his successor at Tarrant Gunville in Dorset managed to "evade this difficulty"? We only know that Lee Warner's diary is "voluminous", but it would be gratuitous to assume that the editors have deliberately excised any paragraphs which might assist a modern country parson to achieve the same evasion. But these are minor difficulties. These six, however humble their station and straitened their sphere, are to be numbered among the men who make a success of their service in the vineyard.

W. G. Addison.
Britford.

The Acts of the Apostles. By R. R. Williams. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

This commentary is not designed for students reading theology at a university or taking Religious Knowledge for the G.C.E. at the advanced level, and I intend to review it on the assumption that the bishop had in mind boys at school who might be studying the Acts as a prescribed book for G.C.E. (ordinary level) or general readers of all ages who are not theological specialists. Some experience of marking examination papers showed me that a need exists for a commentary on Acts which would popularize the more interesting of contemporary theological ideas in the kind of way that some of the previous volumes in the Torch series have succeeded in doing. I took up this new book by the author of *Authority in the Apostolic Age*, re-read the foreword to the series ("the Bible is more than a quarry for the practice of erudition"), and hope was high. The Introduction, it seemed, could hardly have been better done. The reader is given enough information about the questions of authorship and sources and about the theme of Acts to help, without wearying, him.

There is a list of the more important books on Acts and a brief note on the Western text.

But as soon as the "thoughtful reader" (foreword) turns to the exegesis of the first chapter, he is in an utterly foreign world. He is told (1) that "the fact of the Ascension is assumed in many books of the N.T.", and (2) that in the apostolic age it was held of tremendous theological importance; when what he really wants to know is whether ascension-language has any possible meaning or relevance for *him*. A note on the symbolisms and images of the Bible and the meaning of transcendence would have been helpful, with perhaps a quotation from Luther on the Ascension and an allusion to Bultmann and his critics.

The main point of Stephen's speech is "that the leaders of the Jews have no right to claim to be the true followers of Moses" (p. 70), but it is nowhere explicitly stated in this commentary that Stephen is preaching Christ as the fulfilment of the O.T. dispensation, and I am sorry that he did not in this chapter follow Rackham ("still a great stand-by", Williams, p. 13), who wrote: "Stephen is all the time 'preaching Jesus'. He preaches him in his types, especially Joseph and Moses." We may or may not like the uses to which typological exegesis is sometimes put nowadays, but we cannot avoid the fact that the N.T. writers at any rate thought typologically. In short, one might have expected here a paragraph on typology instead of at 7. 45 the ingenuous "*Jesus:* Read Joshua". On 8. 14–17 we read: "The Church of England looks back to this incident as one of the main apostolic precedents for Confirmation." Would it not have been more accurate to have written: "This incident has often been regarded in the Church as affording an apostolic precedent for Confirmation, as for example in the Preface to the Anglican Confirmation Service of 1928, but . . ."; followed by a note on the N.T. theology of initiation (quoted perhaps from the bishop's contribution to the *Theological Word Book of the Bible*)? At the end of the commentary on 12 there is half a blank page which could have been usefully employed with some account of the later life of St Peter and of the excavations at Rome and the claims of the modern Roman Catholic Church. At 13. 38–9 no explanation is given of justification by faith; 13. 48 indicates "a doctrine of predestination in the writer of Acts", but we are not told what predestination means here or has meant in the course of Christian theology. In 15 I do not believe that Dr Williams' readers will grasp the significance of the controversy from: "These emissaries [from James] insisted that Gentile converts should be circumcised, and keep the Jewish law. Apart from the brake which such a rule would have put on the movement of evangelism, it would have turned Christianity into a Jewish sect, and made it very difficult for it to survive the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70."

It seems to me therefore that this book does not fulfil the aim of the Torch series—to interpret the living message of the living God. Nor does it really give us the feel of what life was like in the apostolic Church. I suspect, moreover, that the author has not made

sufficient allowance for the ignorance of his potential readers. Thus, in the sentence just quoted, is it enough to refer to the fall of Jerusalem without adding "when the city was razed by the Romans and the population exterminated or scattered after a Jewish rebellion"? For the same reason books for the general reader really must not suddenly mention J. B. Lightfoot (p. 111) without a footnote of this kind: "Bishop of Durham, 1879–89, formerly Cambridge professor; wrote commentaries on epistles which are classical: dissertation on origins of Christian Ministry at end of his Philippians still valuable."

Cuddesdon College, Oxford. Wilfrid Browning.

A Doctor's Case Book. By Paul Tournier. S.C.M. Press. 16s.

The Bible and Modern Medicine. By A. Rendle Short. The Paternoster Press. 6s.

To interpret the events of life in the light of the Bible falls to us all; and all do it differently. But rarely, perhaps, so differently as Dr Tournier and the late Professor Rendle Short, who between them straddle the mental spectrum from a passionate cerebration bursting on to paper to restrained, quiet-toned practical speech.

It is difficult to outline the scope of the first book. It is not really written in relation to general medicine, and one judges (from the wealth of psychological reference, the restricted range of therapeutic agents occasionally referred to, and the somewhat strained introduction of a few clinical case-histories) that the author is in a psychiatric practice rather than in a practice comparable to that of the ordinary general practitioner in this country. Within this field Dr Tournier makes an energetic attempt to discern the "meaning" of disease, health, pain, death and healing; and his quotation from Siebeck ". . . Health is not an end in itself; it is significant only in so far as life is significant . . ." could almost serve as the text for the whole book. His method is to propose topics and then to pursue them, sometimes unsystematically but always with enthusiasm and humour, and often with insight. His own habit of reading illuminates his writing: "I read little, but always passionately. . . . I do not only read what the author writes; I read as well every train of thought which his writings start in my mind, all the many associations of ideas." It is for readers of the same kind, who seek fuel for their thoughts rather than the discipline of argument and counter-argument, that this book is to be warmly commended.

But for those concerned with clinical medicine, or with a stake in scientific work, three traits detract from the force of the writing. The first is that he belongs to the "science is only . . ." school, betraying this in a strong anti-scientific tone ("the scientific view of the world is a stupid one . . ." "from the standpoint of science there is only a blind concatenation of events . . ." ". . . there is no objection, scientifically speaking, to such experiments on living human beings as were practised in the Nazi concentration camps . . ." ". . . such is the conception that science gives us of man—a 'little collection of

cells' . . .") which sometimes spills over into an anti-rational feeling (". . . for logic is powerless to grasp and to express life . . ."). Anyone is, of course, free to take such an attitude, and will find companions; but it is a costly one, for it is liable to forfeit the attention of the scientist, not because he is being (implicitly) attacked through his subject-matter, but because it may go with a fundamental lack of understanding and even lack of interest in his activities. Secondly, the author runs perilously close to being trapped by the old *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy. Take the anaemic patient on pp. 180–1, whose haemoglobin, for years at 55 per cent., was found, three weeks after disappearance of certain neurotic obsessions, to have risen to 78 per cent. It is possible, indeed, that relief of mental state cured the blood picture. It is also possible, and a more straightforward possibility, that relief of the anaemia (say by the cessation or lessening of a menorrhagia) would relieve the mental state (it would indeed be expected to do so): nothing in the history excludes the second possibility. Yet the story is pointless in the context unless the first possibility is inferred as true.

Third, and most important, is what one may call "the assumption of correct interpretation". An example, on p. 57, is of the author's wife breaking her leg in a fall, which ". . . had its meaning; we realized that God has a message for us. We were trying to do too much . . . my patients lean on me, and I in turn lean on my wife, too much on my wife and not enough on God. I had leant so hard that the support had snapped". One hesitates to intrude on such a personal reaction. Yet how was it known that this was *the* message, and not something quite other—involving a third person, for instance? The story here will support no statement more than that every cloud has a silver lining (his wife's broken leg forced them both to have a much-needed holiday). But the intended force of the narrative was not such a harmless platitude; rather it was to show that there are meanings in events which can be exactly discovered. The thoughtful will admire the using of the accident, but still wonder that this was necessarily the *only* message to be discovered. This is a difficulty fundamental to the whole problem of discerning meaning in life, and it lies at the root of reluctance to seek for it. The fertility of the human mind is such that it can literally find several explanations for anything if it tries to: but how to know which explanation, which answer, which meaning?

It must not be thought, however, that an anti-scientific trend and a tendency to regard interpretation as proof exhaust the book. Two other quotations may serve to show its quality. "The whole of our inquiry into the meaning of medicine leads us to this: we are collaborators with God"; and, in lighter vein, "We always find it more acceptable to have God speaking to us directly rather than through our wives! But we may learn a great deal by listening to what he says to us through them."

Professor Short's much briefer and cheaper book starts from a different point, an attempt to survey and discuss medical matters in the Bible. It could not be complete in so small a compass, but it has a

useful bibliography of accessible references which allow the reader to continue more detailed studies. He provides a terse account of medical ideas in Biblical times, of the main diseases concerned, of demoniacal possession, of the miracles, and of Gethsemane and the death of Christ, pervaded by a deep sincerity which can speak of the water and the blood of the crucifixion without offence. Quiet and factual in tone, the book sometimes strikes home vividly to the medical man; as in Chapter IV when the epidemiology of Transjordan (likely to be close to Biblical conditions) is compared in detail to that of Bristol: such a comparison does more than many word-pictures to enable imagination to bridge the centuries. So, too, does his account of the miracles: "What medical practitioner, even with all modern resources available, would be pleased to see in his consulting room one evening several blind people including one blind from infancy, a dumb epileptic, a woman with severe curvature of the spine, a man with old infantile paralysis causing wasting of one arm, two or three persons stone deaf, a paralytic of 38 years' standing, several lepers, and a couple of raving lunatics? Could a more unhopeful collection be found?" Yet, he adds later, ". . . let us call attention to these cures as signs, and not as examples of broadcast philanthropy. . . . The purpose of the miracles was to show that God was at work, in a new way. . . ."

Although nominally a historico-medical survey rather than a theological discussion, in its own restrained way Professor Short's book, like Dr Tournier's, probes far into the problems of health and disease, and offers its own confident answer.

St Albans. W. D. M. Paton.

SHORTER NOTICES

Men with a Message. By John R. W. Stott. Longmans. 4s.

The Unity of the Bible. By H. H. Rowley. Carey Kingsgate Press. 15s.

The Transcendent Unity of Religions. By Frithjof Schuon. Faber and Faber. 15s.

Sacred Books of the World. By A. C. Bouquet. Penguin Books. 3s. 6d.

It was a pleasure, no penance, to read the Bishop of London's Lent Book, *Men with a Message*. Mr Stott's aim is to "expound the distinctive contribution of each New Testament author", and to "introduce the men as well as to expound the message". Most readers of Theology may find his steady conservatism about authorship unsatisfying. Only in the chapter on Hebrews (in your reviewer's opinion the best in the book) does he depart from the A.V. ascription of authorship. Many also will find his treatment of the gospel sacraments unsympathetic. Baptism (p. 62) is contrasted with faith and compared with circumcision. What St Paul says of the latter is transferred to baptism. (Contrast e.g. Rom. 6. 3 f.) Similarly the im-

plications of John 6 for the meaning of the Holy Communion are evaded (p. 124). Yet the episcopal commendation of the book as "showing the intellectual basis on which a specially busy parish priest builds the framework of his pastoral life" remains exact.

If Mr Stott gives the gospel sacraments less than their due, Prof. Rowley exalts them as the climax of his book. Except in this last chapter the book commands our assent rather than challenges our assumptions. In stating the principle of "Unity in Diversity", the author steers a judicious course between the Scylla of typology and the Charybdis of historicism (Ch. I). The application of this principle to "the Law and the Prophets" (Ch. II) is finely done. Almost your reviewer is persuaded that Amos (5. 21 f.) and Jeremiah (6. 20; 7. 21 f.) do not condemn the cultus. Yet as one of the general readers who are specifically welcomed in the introduction, he would ask the distinguished author: Accepting the main thesis that the prophets and the law are complementary, may not individual prophets on particular occasions have so far forgotten themselves under provocation as to have condemned the cultus, root and branch? Is there a hidden assumption in much dissenting theology that the great prophets were not only always right but also wholly consistent?

In Ch. III (God and Man) and Ch. IV (The Fulfilment of Promise) the theological relationship of the Old and New Covenants is convincingly expounded. The general reader might complain that the footnotes refer too regularly to secondary rather than primary evidences. Thus the assumption that (p. 105) "our Lord thought of his death before it took place in terms of the death of a servant" is supported by reference to four modern scholars but by no gospel texts. This assumption is basic to the writer's interpretation of "the Cross" (Ch. VI). But here again (p. 125, note 2; pp. 132, 133) it is supported by secondary authorities. Yet on the whole the author continues to command our assent.

It is in the last chapter (The Christian Sacraments) that most of us will find our assumptions challenged. As "paedobaptists" we are categorized, castigated but not caricatured. By this very designation the author puts us in our place and brings our practice of Infant Baptism under the judgment of the Word of God. We may not accept his strictures. But we may be encouraged, like some of those engaged in framing a baptism service for the Church of South India, to regard adult baptism as the norm in a missionary situation, with infant baptism as a permitted and indeed honourable alternative. No less valuable for ecumenical thinking is the careful treatment of the sacrificial element in the Holy Communion with which the book concludes. Prof. Rowley does more than demonstrate the unity of the Bible to our satisfaction; in passing he makes a positive contribution to the unity of the Church.

The author of *The Transcendent Unity of Religions* would take unity a stage further. The reader is warned at once that "complex, not to say 'complicated' truths do exist"—acceptable enough if reference was not already being made to the "spiritual élite" (p. 12) which reappears as the "intellectual élite" (p. 48). We learn that "the

intellectuality of animals . . . of plants corresponds cosmologically to the angelic intellectuality" (p. 22). "Esoteric knowledge dissolves the exoteric viewpoint as a preliminary to reabsorbing it in the centre from which it came" (p. 24).

Eventually the Bible comes under interpretation. "Esoterically David's desire to marry Bathsheba could not be a transgression, since the quality of Prophet can only be attached to men who are free from passion; whatever may be the appearances . . . in so far as the story concerns Uriah . . . David's manner of action should not be judged according to the moral point of view" (p. 60 f.). Again: "The Qoran, by its apparent denial of Christ's death, is simply affirming that Christ was not killed in reality—which is obvious not only as regards the divine nature of the God-Man, but also as regards his human nature since it was resurrected. . . ."

Those to whom such Gnosticism (there is even a trace of a Demiurge, p. 177) makes nonsense are treated with aristocratic courtesy throughout. Scorn is reserved, obscurely, for "certain ignorant people imbued with hypocritical, iconoclastic, blasphemous and impotent puritanism, who pronounce the word 'spirit' all the more readily because they are the last to know what it really stands for" (p. 88).

Dr Bouquet's new Pelican is a companion to his former one, *Comparative Religion*. A fascinating selection of sacred texts is interspersed with introductory notes. He wishes "most emphatically to disclaim any intention of seeking to compile a 'Bible of the World'. Any valuation of the quality of the passages must be left to the reader's own judgment" (p. 20). His own judgment may perhaps be deduced from his final section, "The New Christianity", a lyrical selection from the less traditional "numbers" in "Songs of Praise". He could legitimately claim for himself the words of Justin Marytr which he has taken for the motto of this book. "We have shown that Christ is the Word (Logos) of whom the whole human race are partakers, and those who lived according to reason (logos) are Christians, even though accounted atheists." But in what sense can this claim be properly made at all?

BANGALORE. A. H. DAMMERS.

THE STUDENT'S GUIDE THROUGH THE TALMUD. By Z. H. Chajes, trans. J. Shachter. East and West Library. 30s.

This volume is a further valuable addition to the literature on Judaism now being made available to the English-reading world through the East and West Library. The original, written in Hebrew, appeared just over a century ago at a formatve period in the history of Jewish liberation. The present translation has been ably made by the Rabbi of the Jewish Community of Northern Ireland, Jacob Shachter, who has also added a short biographical sketch of the author, a brief but useful survey of Talmudical Introductions down to the time of Chajes, and copious critical and explanatory matter printed as footnotes to the text.

The subject of this treatise is one of importance to Christian and

Jew alike, and indeed to all students of religion. *Torah*, variously translated and variously interpreted, means much more than "law" in the legal or even in the moral sense. It covers all that we understand by instruction and learning, imparted by God himself and also by his chosen instruments. Jews and Christians share a common written tradition in what is generally known as the Old Testament. But after Old Testament times, and notably after the time of Jesus, Jewish and Christian tradition separated and for many centuries developed in almost complete isolation the one from the other. While the New Testament and later Christian writings were for the most part available to and read by Jews, Jewish post-Biblical writings, and in particular the Talmud, were not easily accessible to Christians. Language was one of the main barriers, and so all modern editions and commentaries in translation are to be warmly welcomed.

The reconciliation of the old and the new, the extent to which the divine revelation is continued in oral as well as in written tradition, the relative value of commonly accepted truth and later local interpretations, these are amongst the considerations treated in this book. The combination of a staunch belief in the Sinaitic origin of the whole Torah with an independent sifting of all the evidence makes this work both stimulating and illuminating.

C. Witton-Davies.

St Davids.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Blackfriars Publications: A.-M. Roguet, O.P., *The Sacraments: Signs of Life* (6s. and 8s. 6d.).

Blackwell: William Elton (Ed.), *Aesthetics and Language* (21s.).

Desclée: J. le Cour Grandmaison, *Le monde n'est pas un "combinat" géant* [The pope's Christmas message of 1952, text and commentary] (n.p.); M. Labourdette, *Foi catholique et problèmes modernes* [The encyclical *Humani generis* and other discourses of Pius XII, text and commentary] (n.p.).

Eastern Churches Quarterly: Irmgard M. de Vries, *The Epistles, Gospels and Tones of the Byzantine Liturgical Year* [reprinted from *E.C.Q.*] (2s. 6d.).

Eyre and Spottiswoode: K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (63s.).

S.C.M. Press: John Foster, *Why the Church?* (5s.); R. P. C. Hanson, *II Corinthians* (6s. 6d.).

Sheed and Ward: Father Cuthbert, O.F.M. (Ed.), *God and the Supernatural—A Catholic Statement of the Christian Faith* [a new edition] (12s. 6d.); C. H. Talbot, *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany* (16s.).

S.P.C.K.: *The Revised Canons of the Church of England Further Considered* [The text of each canon in the form it had reached by March, 1954] (9s. 6d.); Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Church from Queen Margaret to the Reformation* (1s.).

Verlag Lambert Schneider (Heidelberg): Hans Ehrenberg, *In der Schule Pascals.*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON